arXiv:1612.08537v1 [cs.CC] 27 Dec 2016

# The probability of a computable output from a random oracle *

George Barmpalias Douglas Cenzer Christopher P. Porter

December 28, 2016

**Abstract.** Consider a universal Turing machine that produces a partial or total function (or a binary stream), based on the answers to the binary queries that it makes during the computation. We study the probability that the machine will produce a computable function when it is given a random stream of bits as the answers to its queries. Surprisingly, we find that these probabilities are the entire class of real numbers in $(0, 1)$ that can be written as the difference of two halting probabilities relative to the halting problem. In particular, there are universal Turing machines which produce a computable output with probability exactly 1/2. Our results contrast a large array of facts (the most well-known being the randomness of Chaitin's halting probability) which witness maximal initial segment complexity of probabilities associated with universal machines. Our proof uses recent advances in algorithmic randomness.

**George Barmpalias**

State Key Lab of Computer Science, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. School of Mathematics, Statistics and Operations Research, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

*E-mail:* barmpalias@gmail.com. *Web:* http://barmpalias.net

**Douglas Cenzer**

Department of Mathematics University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

*E-mail:* cenzer@math.ufl.edu. *Web:* http://people.clas.ufl.edu/cenzer

**Christopher P. Porter**

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Drake University, Des Moines, IA 50311

*E-mail:* cp@cpporter.com. *Web:* http://cpporter.com

*Barmpalias was supported by the 1000 Young Talents Plan from the Chinese Government, grant no. D1101130. Additional support was received by the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) and the Institute of Software of the CAS. Cenzer was partiallly supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation SEALS grant NSF DMS-1362273. Porter was supported by the National Security Agency Mathematical Sciences Program grant H98230-I6-I-D310 as part of the Young Investigator's Program.

# 1 Introduction

A well-known way to obtain an algorithmically random stream is via the following thought experiment due to Chaitin [Cha75]. Consider an oracle universal Turing machine that operates in the binary alphabet and performs a computation according to the answers it receives to the oracle-queries that it poses. Such a computation may halt (perhaps with some string written on an output tape) or may continue indefinitely. If we run the machine, and during the computation we answer the adaptive queries that appear in a random manner (providing random bits as the answers), then we may consider the probability that the machine halts.[1] Chaitin [Cha75] showed that the binary expansion of this real number is algorithmically random, in the classic sense of Martin-Löf [ML66].

Subsequent work revealed the algorithmic randomness of a variety of probabilities associated with universal computations, using an approach which establishes the maximum possible level of algorithmic randomness that is possible given the arithmetical complexity of the associated properties. As we elaborate in Section 2.1, this methodology also provided characterizations of the probabilities in purely algorithmic terms, while a number of examples have been noticed where it is not applicable.

In the present paper we consider the probability that a universal oracle Turing machine $U$ produces a computable binary stream when reading from a random oracle. We find that this property is not amenable to the above standard methodology, and devise a different method in order to obtain the following complete characterization of the associated probabilities.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The probability that a (universal) oracle Turing machine $U$ produces a computable output when reading from a random oracle has the form $\alpha-\beta$, where $\alpha,\beta$ are $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals. Conversely, given $\alpha,\beta$ as above such that $\alpha-\beta\in(0,1)$, there exists a universal oracle Turing machine $U$ which produces a computable output with probability exactly $\alpha-\beta$.*

We note that the differences of left-c.e. reals, also known as d.c.e. reals, form a field under the usual addition and multiplication, as was demonstrated by Ambos-Spies, Weihrauch, and Zheng [ASWZ00]. Raichev [Rai05] and Ng [Ng06] showed that this field is real-closed. More recently, Miller [Mil16] developed a theory of derivation on the d.c.e. reals, generalizing a result from [BLP16] which will be crucial in the proof of our main result. The same facts hold by direct relativization for the class of reals in Theorem 1.1, namely the class of differences of $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals.

It follows from Theorem 1.1 that, although the property of producing a computable output is $\Sigma^0_3$-complete, its universal probability can be as simple as 1/2 and as complicated as Martin-Löf random or even Martin-Löf random relative to the halting problem.

**Corollary 1.2.** *There is a universal oracle Turing machine that produces a computable stream with probability 1/2.*

The contrast here is that the complexity of a universal machine in combination with a nontrivial $\Sigma^0_3$-complete property does not necessarily transfer to the probability of this property. As we are going to explain later on, there are two main nontrivial reasons for this phenomenon:

[1] Chaitin [Cha75] originally used self-delimiting machines in this thought experiment, but our version can easily be seen to be equivalent.

- properties of bases for Martin-Löf randomness;
- properties of differences of universal halting probabilities.

An oracle $X$ is a basis for Martin-Löf randomness if it is computed by another oracle which is Martin-Löf random relative to $X$. This class was introduced by Kučera [Kuč93] and has been studied extensively since. First, we will use the fact from Hirschfeldt, Nies, and Stephan [HNS07] that bases for Martin-Löf randomness are computable from the halting problem in order to show that the probability in Theorem 1.1 is the same as the probability of another property which has simpler arithmetical complexity, namely that of being defined as the disjunction of a $\Pi^0_2$ and a $\Sigma^0_2$ formula. This will be sufficient for one direction of the characterization in Theorem 1.1. For the other direction we will use a property of differences of universal halting probabilities that was recently discovered in [BLP16]. A simple way to state this property is that if $\alpha, \beta$ are universal halting probabilities and $q > 1$ is a rational number, then at least one of $\alpha - \beta$, $q \cdot \alpha - \beta$ is Martin-Löf random and either a left-c.e. or a right-c.e. real.

## 1.1 Overview of this article

After the background and terminology of Section 1.2, we briefly discuss previous work in the literature regarding the algorithmic randomness of probabilities of universal machines in Section 2.1. The point we are making here is that the characterization given in our result, Theorem 1.1, presents a new paradigm in relation to the existing work on the algorithmic randomness of probabilities of machines. In Section 2.2 we briefly discuss a universal probability in the context of formal systems and Chaitin's popular metamathematical considerations. We point out that the probability that a universal machine will produce an undecidable sentence of Peano arithmetic is a Martin-Löf random left-c.e. real. This probability is of the form $\alpha - \beta$ for two Martin-Löf random left-c.e. reals $\alpha, \beta$, just like the property of Theorem 1.1. However it behaves very differently, since it can always be approximated computably from the left (a consequence of the recent work in [BLP16]). This example provides further context for our main result, and shows that a natural property that can be expressed as the difference of two $\Sigma^0_n$ classes does not necessarily admit a probability characterization such as the one given in Theorem 1.1. Finally Section 3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 1.2 Background, notation and terminology

The reader will need to be familiar with the basic notions of computability theory and the definition of Martin-Löf randomness [ML66]. Let $\emptyset^{(n)}$ be the $n$th iteration of the halting set and let $\mathbf{0}^{(n)}$ its Turing degree. Let $\emptyset'$ also denote the halting problem and let $\mathbf{0}'$ denote the degree of the halting problem. For each $n > 0$ we say that a real is $n$-random if it is Martin-Löf random relative to $\emptyset^{(n-1)}$. A real is called left-c.e. if it is the limit of a computable increasing sequence of rational numbers. Similarly, a real is called right-c.e. if it is the limit of a computable decreasing sequence of rational numbers. These notions relativize with respect to $\emptyset^{(n)}$ for each $n > 0$. In the present paper the $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. and the $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. reals will be particularly relevant.

Some familiarity with the celebrated characterization of halting probabilities as the Martin-Löf random left-c.e. reals will also be useful. This well-known result was a consequence of the cumulative effort

of Solovay [Sol75], Calude, Hertling, Khoussainov, and Wang [CHKW01], and Kučera and Slaman [KS01]. A summary of basic facts about the representation of open $\Sigma^0_n$ classes of reals as $\Sigma^0_n$ prefix-free sets of strings and the characterization of their measures as the $\mathbf{0}^{(n)}$-left c.e. reals can be found in [BCP16]. If $Q$ is a set of strings, we let $[\![Q]\!]$ be the set of reals which have a prefix in $Q$. Moreover given a class $C$ of reals we let $\mu(C)$ denote the Lebesgue measure of $C$.

As we indicated early in Section 1, our Turing machine model is the standard machine $M$ with a one-way read-only input tape, a working tape and a one-way write-only output tape which is initially blank and on which the output is printed in binary contiguously (i.e. without leaving blanks between two bits) by a head that moves only to the right. Here the contents of the input tape $X$ can be treated as an oracle, or alternatively as a random variable, in which case we talk about *randomized* or *probabilistic* machines and computations. In this case $M(X)$ denotes the contents of the output tape when the machine is run indefinitely. Alternatively, the reader may think in terms of monotone machines such that those used in Levin in [Lev71, Lev73] in order to give a definition of the algorithmic complexity of finite objects (a similar notion was used earlier by Solomonoff [Sol64]). Let $\preceq$ denote the prefix relation amongst strings. A monotone machine can be thought of as a Turing machine $M$ (or a partial computable function) operating on finite binary programs with the monotonicity property that if $\sigma \preceq \tau$, $M(\sigma)\downarrow$, and $M(\tau)\downarrow$, then $M(\sigma) \preceq M(\tau)$. In this case, given an infinite binary stream $X$, we let $M(X)$ denote the supremum of $M(\sigma)$ for all prefixes $\sigma$ of $X$. The machines constructed in Section 3.2 are best thought as monotone machines. In any case, the underlying notion is that of an infinitary computation, which is performed over an infinite number of stages and where the output is either a binary string or a binary stream (i.e. an infinite binary sequence).

A Turing machine is universal if it can simulate any other Turing machine with a constant overhead on the input tape. Formally, given an effective list $(M_e)$ of all oracle machines, an oracle machine $U$ is universal if there exists a computable function $e \mapsto \sigma_e$ from numbers into a prefix-free set of strings such that $U(\sigma_e * X)[s] = M_e(X)[s]$ for all $e, X, s$, where '$[s]$' indicates the state of the preceding computation after $s$ many steps. For the case of monotone machines, the definition of universality is analogous.[2]

Given an oracle Turing machine $M$ we consider properties of oracles $X$ of the type

$$\mathcal{P}(X): \text{ the output } M(X) \text{ belongs to a class } C.$$

The probability of such a property $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to an oracle machine $M$ is simply the measure of the set of oracles $X$ which have the property $\mathcal{P}$. When we talk about the *universal probability of a property* $\mathcal{P}$ we mean the probability of $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to a universal oracle Turing machine. This is the formal context for our main result, Theorem 1.1, which refers to the property that $M(X)$ generates an infinite computable binary stream. In Section 2.1 the reader may find various examples of different properties $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to which the universal probabilities have been characterized.

More special results and notions will be defined and cited in the text, when we need them. For example we make use of relatively recent results from Hirschfeldt, Nies, and Stephan [HNS07] as well as Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye [BLP16]. For a more comprehensive background in the area between

[2] We stress that this standard notion of universality is quite different than the notion of *optimal machines* in the context of Kolmogorov complexity (e.g. see [LV97, Definition 2.1]).

computability theory and algorithmic randomness we refer the reader to the monographs Downey and Hirschfeldt [DH10] and Nies [Nie09], while Calude [Cal02] has an information-theoretic perspective. Odifreddi [Odi89, Odi99] is a standard reference in classical computability theory while Li and Vitányi [LV97] is a standard reference in the theory of Kolmogorov complexity (which provides another facet of algorithmic randomness).

# 2 Algorithmic randomness of probabilities

We give some context for our main result and demonstrate its uniqueness in this line of research.

## 2.1 Previous work—randomness by maximality

Since Chaitin's work many more examples of random numbers have been exhibited as probabilities of certain properties of various models universal machines. A major influence in this line of work was a series of papers by Becher and her collaborators (e.g. [BDC01, BC02, BG05]), while the authors of the present article recently pushed this line of work to obtain complete characterizations of such probabilities in terms of algorithmic randomness in [BCP16].[3] Although the arguments employed in these proofs of randomness may seem varied (some expressed in terms of initial segment complexity and some in terms of statistical tests) they all follow a general paradigm, which we may call *randomness by maximality*. For example,

> given a property $P$ of a certain arithmetical complexity, one shows that the probability that a universal oracle Turing machine will have $P$ when it runs on a random oracle is algorithmically random with respect to all statistical tests of the same arithmetical complexity as $P$.

Note that the arithmetical complexity of the given property automatically imposes a respective upper bound on the level of the algorithmic randomness that the associated probability possess. Hence in this methodology one shows that the probability of the property $P$ is *as algorithmically random as it can possibly be, given its arithmetical complexity*, hence the name *randomness by maximality*.

Such a plan can often be carried out, as it is elaborated in [BCP16], by embedding a member of the universal Martin-Löf test of the respective arithmetical complexity into an oracle Turing machine $M$ in such a way that the class of oracles $X$ that make the computation $M(X)$ satisfy property $P$ is identical to the class of oracles $X$ that fail the respective Martin-Löf test.[4] This methodology (and its counterpart in terms of initial segment complexity) has produced many results of the form

> the probability of property $P$ which lies at the $n$th level of arithmetical complexity is algorithmically random with respect to all statistical test of the same arithmetical complexity.

[3] In [BCP16] the reader will also find a more detailed summary of the results in this topic.

[4] For example, in order to show that the halting probability (as described in the example above) is Martin-Löf random, one can consider a member $V$ of the universal Martin-Löf test and a machine $M$ which halts exactly on the oracles in $U$. Then the halting probability $\alpha$ of $M$ will be the measure of $V$, which is Martin-Löf random. Since $M$ will be simulated by the universal oracle Turing machine $U$, the halting probability of $U$ will be the sum of the Martin-Löf random number $\alpha$ and another real of similar complexity, which (by known facts) has to be Martin-Löf random.

For example, halting is a $\Sigma^0_1$ property, and the halting probability of a universal machine is random with respect to all unrelativized (hence $\Sigma^0_1$) Martin-Löf tests, also called 1-random. Similarly, $\Sigma^0_2$ properties (e.g. infinite/finite output) often produce 2-random probabilities (e.g. [BDC01, BCP16]), $\Sigma^0_3$ properties (e.g. almost everywhere totality of computed function) often produce 3-random probabilities (e.g. [BC02, BCP16]) and some $\Sigma^0_4$ properties (e.g. universality) produce 4-random probabilities [BD12]. In most of these case, this maximality approach also allows for a complete characterization of the probabilities considered in terms of algorithmic definability and randomness.

Despite all these examples, it has been noticed on several occasions that the probability of a property with respect to the universal Turing machine may not necessarily have the maximum algorithmic randomness that its arithmetical complexity allows. For example, Becher, Figueira, Grigorieff, and Miller [BFGM06] showed that for any $n > 1$, the probability that the universal oracle Turing machine will halt and output a string in a given $\Sigma^0_n$-complete set (this is a $\Sigma^0_n$-complete property) is not $n$-random. A few more such counterexamples are briefly discussed in [BCP16].

## 2.2 Restricted halting probabilities and differences

Following Chaitin's widely publicized metamathematical considerations (mainly based on [Cha75, Cha92]), part of the appeal of the halting probability comes from its connections with formal systems of mathematics. For example, if we effectively identify binary strings with statements in Peano arithmetic, the set $A$ of theorems of Peano arithmetic is a c.e. set of strings. Chaitin [Cha04] observed that in this case the probability $\Omega(A)$ that the universal machine will produce a theorem of Peano arithmetic is a Martin-Löf random number whose left Dedekind cut is computably enumerable. Let us now consider the set $B$ of arithmetical sentences which are undecidable in the formal system of Peano arithmetic, i.e. neither they nor their negation is provable from the axioms of Peano arithmetic. The set $B$ is $\Pi^0_1$ and by Gödel's incompleteness theorem, it is nonempty. Which properties are satisfied by the probability $\Omega(B)$ that the randomized universal machine will produce an undecidable sentence? In [BLP16], answering a problem from [MN06, Question 8.10] and [BG05, BFGM06], it was shown that for any nonempty $\Pi^0_1$ set $B$, the number $\Omega(B)$ is both left-c.e. and Martin-Löf random. Applying this result to the set of undecidable sentences, we get the following counterintuitive fact.

**Theorem 2.1.** *The probability that the randomized universal machine outputs an undecidable sentence is a left-c.e. Martin-Löf random real.*

The contrast here is that, although we cannot effectively enumerate the undecidable sentences, we can enumerate the left Dedekind cut of the probability of an undecidable output, just like we did for the probability of a theorem of Peano arithmetic (the latter being computably enumerable). If we recall the characterization of universal halting probabilities as the Martin-Löf random left-c.e. reals, then it follows that the probability of an undecidable sentence with respect to any universal machine $U$ is equal to the probability of a theorem of Peano arithmetic with respect to another universal machine $V$.

We can continue this discussion briefly by considering the probability that the randomized universal machine will output a true arithmetical sentence. Becher, Figueira, Grigorieff, and Miller [BFGM06] showed that the halting probability restricted to any $\Sigma^0_n$-complete set is Martin-Löf random[5] and not

[5]It is worth noting that Kobayashi [Kob93] had obtained a weaker version of this result for a restricted notion of $\Sigma^0_n$-

$n$-random. Since the set of $n$-quantifier arithmetical sentences is an example of a $\Sigma^0_n$-complete set, we have the following.

**Theorem 2.2** (Becher, Figueira, Grigorieff, and Miller [BFGM06])**.** *For each $n > 1$, the probability that the randomized universal machine outputs a true $n$-quantifier arithmetical sentence is Martin-Löf random but not $n$-random.*

Two questions present themselves at this point. First, what about the probability that the randomized universal machine outputs a true arithmetical sentence (of any number of quantifiers)? Is it algorithmically random, and if yet, how much? Second, is the probability in Theorem 2.2 Martin-Löf random with respect to $\emptyset'$ or $\emptyset''$ for sufficiently large $n$? These questions do not seem to be amenable to the analysis in [BFGM06]. We leave them open for consideration, and move on to our main topic.

This discussion is interesting as a continuation of Chaitin's metamathematical considerations, but its main purpose is to provide some additional context for our main result, Theorem 1.1. In particular, Theorem 2.1 shows that even in situations where the maximality paradigm of Section 2.1 does not apply (e.g. when the property in question is definable by the disjunction of a $\Sigma^0_n$ and a $\Pi^0_n$ formula) it could still be the case that its universal probability is *necessarily* maximally random (in the case of a $\Sigma^0_n \vee \Pi^0_n$ formula this means $n$-random).[6] Hence Theorem 1.1 does not have a precedent in this line of research, and all these examples reveal wide variety of algorithmic behavior that the probability of a property of the universal machine can have.

# 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

First, in Section 3.1, we show the first part of Theorem 1.1, namely that we can express the universal probability of a computable output as the difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals. Section 3.2 contains the first step towards the converse of our main result. We show that the probability of a computable output can be any $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. or $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real provided that we choose an appropriate machine. Note however that we do not yet guarantee this for a universal Turing machine. The first step toward the latter conclusion is made in Lemma 3.7 of the next section, which shows that the universal probability of a computable output can be chosen to be any Martin-Löf random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real. We conclude Section 3.3 with the proof of the latter part of Theorem 1.1, in an argument that uses all the previous lemmas.

## 3.1 The probability of a computable output as the difference of $0'$-left-c.e. reals

Given an oracle Turing machine $M$ we are interested in the measure of the oracles $X$ such that $M(X)$ is total and computable. Let $\mathtt{TOT}(M)$ denote the $\Pi^0_2$ class of reals $X$ such that $M(X)$ is total. Also let $\mathtt{INCTOT}(M)$ be the class of reals $X$ such that $M(X)$ is total and incomputable. Then we are interested in the measure of the class

$$\mathtt{TOT}(M) - \mathtt{INCTOT}(M). \tag{3.1.1}$$

completeness which he called *constant overhead completeness*. We also note that the result in Becher, Figueira, Grigorieff, and Miller [BFGM06] applies for optimal machines in general, not just universal machines.

[6] Theorem 2.1 is an example of this phenomenon for $n = 1$, while a relativization of it produces examples for any $n$.

We note that $\texttt{INCTOT}(M)$ is not generally definable with 2 quantifiers, so that the above class appears more complex than we would ideally wish. Despite this, we show that the measure of this class can be expressed as the difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals.

Recall that an oracle $X$ is a basis for Martin-Löf randomness if it is computed by another oracle which is Martin-Löf random relative to $X$. Also note that by Hirschfeldt, Nies, and Stephan [HNS07] bases for Martin-Löf randomness are computable from the halting problem. On the other hand 2-random reals do not compute any incomputable set which is also computable from the halting problem. This latter fact follows from the fact that the class of oracles that compute a $\Delta^0_2$ set $X$ form a $\Sigma^0_3$ class, which is null when $X$ is noncomputable (by [dLMSS55], also see [DNWY06]). These facts will be used in the proof of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The probability that an oracle Turing machine $M$ produces a computable output when reading from a random oracle has the form $\alpha - \beta$, where $\alpha, \beta$ are $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals in* $(0, 1)$.

**Proof.** If $\alpha, \beta$ are $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals in $(0, 1)$, let $q \in (\max\{\alpha, \beta\}, 1)$ be a rational number and note that

$$\alpha - \beta = -\beta - (-\alpha) = (q - \beta) - (-q - \alpha).$$

Hence the difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals in $(0, 1)$ can be written as the difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. reals in $(0, 1)$. Hence it suffices to show that the measure of (3.1.1) can be written as the difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. reals in $(0, 1)$.

Note that while $\texttt{TOT}(M)$ is a $\Pi^0_2$ class, $\texttt{INCTOT}(M)$ is a $\Pi^0_3$ class, so we need to find a simpler class which has the same measure as $\texttt{INCTOT}(M)$. Let $(V_i)$ be a universal Martin-Löf test and define

$$\texttt{INCTOT}^*(M) = \texttt{TOT}(M) \cap \{X \mid X \in \cap_i V_i^{M(X)}\}.$$

This is the class of reals $X$ such that $M(X)$ is total and $X$ is not Martin-Löf random relative to $M(X)$. Observe that $\texttt{INCTOT}^*(M)$ is a $\Pi^0_2$ class. If we show that

$$\text{for every 2-random } X \text{ we have } X \in \texttt{INCTOT}(M) \Leftrightarrow X \in \texttt{INCTOT}^*(M). \tag{3.1.2}$$

then $\mu(\texttt{INCTOT}(M)) = \mu(\texttt{INCTOT}^*(M))$ which means that

$$\mu(\texttt{TOT}(M)) - \mu(\texttt{INCTOT}^*(M))$$

is the measure of (3.1.1). Since the above two classes are $\Pi^0_2$, their measures are $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. reals, so this proves the statement. It remains to prove (3.1.2).

First, suppose that $X$ is 2-random and $X \in \texttt{INCTOT}$. Then by definition $M(X)$ is total and incomputable. If $X \notin \cap_i U_i^{M(X)}$ then $X$ would be Martin-Löf random relative to the incomputable set $M(X)$ which it computes, so $M(X)$ would be a basis for Martin-Löf randomness. But we know that such sets are $\Delta^0_2$ and we also know that no 2-random real computes a noncomputable $\Delta^0_2$ set. Hence we arrived at a contradiction, which means that $X \in \cap_i U_i^{M(X)}$.

Conversely, suppose that $X$ is 2-random, $M(X)$ is total and $X \in \cap_i U_i^{M(X)}$. Then $M(X)$ must be incomputable, otherwise $X$ would not be 2-random (or even 1-random). So $X$ belongs to $\texttt{INCTOT}$. This concludes the proof of (3.1.2) and the proof of the lemma. □

### 3.2 A Turing machine for each $0'$-left-c.e. and each $0'$-right-c.e. real

Here we make the first step towards the proof of the second part of Theorem 1.1. We wish to show that given any $\alpha$ which is either a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. or a $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real, there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that the measure of $\mathtt{TOT}(M) - \mathtt{INCTOT}(M)$ is $\alpha$. In order to do this we use the fact that every $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real is the weight of a $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings. Given such a set of strings, we wish to produce a special oracle Turing machine $M$ that has the desired property (namely $M(X)$ being total and computable) exactly on reals that have (alternatively those which do not have) a prefix in the $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings. Although its not possible to achieve this in both cases, we will be successful almost everywhere, in the probabilistic sense, which is sufficient for our purposes.

We need the following fact.

**Lemma 3.2** (Canonical $\Sigma^0_2$ approximations)**.** *If $U$ is a $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings, there exists a computable sequence $(V_s)$ of finite prefix-free sets of strings such that*

*(i) for each $\sigma$ we have $\sigma \in U$ if and only if there exists $s_0$ such that $\sigma$ has a prefix in all $V_s$, $s > s_0$;*

*(ii) there are infinitely many $s$ such that $V_s \subseteq U$.*

*We call $(V_s)$ a* canonical $\Sigma^0_2$ approximation to $U$.

**Proof.** Given $U$, there exists a c.e. operator $W$ such that $W^{\emptyset'} = U$. We can modify the enumeration of $W$ (obtaining a modified $\widehat{W}$) with respect to a computable enumeration $(\emptyset'_s)$ of $\emptyset'$, so that if $n \in \emptyset'_{s+1} - \emptyset'_s$ for some number $n$ and stage $s$, any number $m$ which is in $W^{\emptyset'_{s+1}}_{s+1}$ with oracle use above $n$ is not counted in $\widehat{W}^{\emptyset'_{s+1}}_{s+1}$. In other words, the enumeration of $\widehat{W}^{\emptyset'}$ follows the enumeration of $W^{\emptyset'}$ except that it delays the enumeration of certain numbers until a stage where the associated segment of $\emptyset'$ remains stable between the current and the previous stages. This is a standard technique which is known as the *hat-trick* (originally due to Lachlan) and is applied to functionals and c.e. operators relative to c.e. sets (see Odifreddi [Odi99, Section X.3] for an extended discussion on this method). Let $U_s = \widehat{W}^{\emptyset'_s}_s$ and let $V_s$ contain the minimal strings in $U_s$. Clearly all $V_s$ are finite and prefix-free sets of strings. A *true* enumeration into $\emptyset'$ is an enumeration of a number $n$ into $\emptyset'$ at stage $s$ such that $\emptyset'_s \upharpoonright_n = \emptyset' \upharpoonright_n$. A *true stage* is a stage $s$ at which a true enumeration occurs. Clearly there exist infinitely many true enumerations and stages. By the choice of $\widehat{W}$ we have that if $s$ is a true stage then $U_s \subseteq U$ and since $U$ is prefix-free so is $U_s$ and thus we have $V_s = U_s \subseteq U$. Moreover, if $\sigma \in U$ then $\sigma \in U_s$ for all but finitely many stages $s$, which means that $\sigma$ has a prefix in $V_s$ for all but finitely many $s$. Finally, by the hat trick, if $\sigma$ has a prefix in $V_s$ for all but finitely many stages $s$, we necessarily have $\sigma \in U$, because $V_t \subseteq U$ for infinitely many stages $t$. □

**Lemma 3.3.** *Suppose that $Q$ is a $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings. Then there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that $M(X)$ is total for all $X$, and, for every Martin-Löf random real $X$, the following clauses are equivalent:*

*(a) $M(X)$ is computable;*

*(b) $M(X)$ is computable and $M(X) = \eta * 0^\omega$ for some string $\eta$;*

*(c) $X \in [\![Q]\!]$;*

**Proof.** Given a $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings $Q$ we use Lemma 3.2 and consider a canonical $\Sigma^0_2$ approximation $(Q_s)$ to $Q$. Note that a string $\sigma$ belongs to $Q$ if and only if it has a prefix in $Q_s$ for almost all $s$. We will use $(Q_s)$ in order to build an oracle machine $M$ with the required properties. We may assume that for each $s$, the strings in $Q_s$ have length less than $s$. We build $M$ as a monotone machine. At stage 0, we define $M(\lambda) = \lambda$. At stage $s+1$ we define $M(\sigma)$ for all strings of length $\sum_{i\leq s} 2^i = 2^{s+1} - 1$. Hence at stage 1, we define $M(\sigma)$ for all strings $\sigma$ of length 1, at stage 2, we define $M(\sigma)$ for all strings of length 3, and so on. Moreover we ensure that the length of $M(\sigma)$ is equal to the length of $\sigma$. Hence at stage $s+1$, for each string $\sigma$ of length $2^{s+1} - 1$ with a prefix $\tau$ of length $2^s - 1$ we need to determine $2^s$ additional bits which we can suffix to $M(\tau)$ in order to define $M(\sigma)$.

At stage $s + 1$ do the following for each string $\sigma$ of length $2^{s+1} - 1$ and its prefix $\tau$ of length $2^s - 1$. If there is a prefix of $\sigma$ in $Q_s$, then let $M(\sigma) = M(\tau) * 0^{2^s}$. Otherwise let $M(\sigma) = M(\tau) * \rho$ where $\rho$ is the string such that $\sigma \upharpoonright_{|M(\tau)|} *\rho = \sigma$, i.e. the last $|\sigma| - |M(\tau)|$ many bits of $\sigma$. This completes the construction of $M$

Clearly $M$ is a monotone machine and $M(X)$ is total for all reals $X$. Moreover by the construction and the properties of $(Q_s)$ we have that

$$\text{if } \sigma \in Q \text{ then for each } X \text{ extending } \sigma \text{ there exists a string } \rho \text{ such that } M(X) = \rho * 0^\omega.$$

Indeed, if $\sigma \in Q$ then there exists a stage $s_0 > 0$ such that $\sigma \in Q_s$ for all $s \geq s_0$. In this case for each $X$ that has prefix $\sigma$ the construction gives that $M(X) = \rho * 0^\omega$ for some string $\rho$ of length $2^{s_0-1} - 1$.

Recall that there are infinitely many $s$ such that $Q_s \subseteq Q$. Hence if $X$ does not have a prefix in $Q$, there are infinitely many stages $s$ such that $X$ does not have a prefix in $Q_s$. Let $(\varphi_e)$ be a computable enumeration of all partial computable functions and for each $e, s$ let $V_{s+1}(e)$ be

- the set of strings $\eta$ of length $2^{s+1} - 1$ such that $\eta(i) = \varphi_e(i)$ for all $i \in [2^{s+1} - 2^s, 2^{s+1})$, if $\varphi_e \upharpoonright_{2^{s+1}}$ is defined;
- the empty set, otherwise.

By the construction we have $\mu(V_{s+1}(e)) \leq 2^{-s}$ for each $s, e.$ and $V_{s+1}(e)$ is uniformly c.e. in $e, s$. Hence $(V_{s+1}(e))$ is a Martin-Löf test for each $e$. Hence if $X$ is Martin-Löf random and $e \in \mathbb{N}$, then $X$ has a prefix in $V_{s+1}(e)$ for only finitely many $s$.

Now we can show that if $X$ is Martin-Löf random and does not have a prefix in $Q$ then $M(X)$ is not computable. Indeed, if $\varphi_e = M(X)$ then at each stage $s + 1$ such that $X$ does not have a prefix in $Q_s$, the construction would define the last $2^s$ many digits of $M(X \upharpoonright 2^{s+1} - 1)$ to be the last $2^s$ many digits of $X \upharpoonright 2^{s+1} - 1$, which means that the latter coincides with the last $2^s$ many digits of $\varphi_e \upharpoonright_{2^{s+1}-1}$. But this means that $X \in V_{s+1}(e)$. Hence by the assumption that $\varphi_e = M(X)$ and $X \notin [\![Q]\!]$ we deduce that $X \in [\![V_{s+1}(e)]\!]$ for infinitely many $s$. Since $(V_{s+1}(e))$ is a Martin-Löf test this means that $X$ is not Martin-Löf random. We have shown that

$$\text{if } X \text{ is Martin-Löf random and } X \notin [\![Q]\!] \text{ then } M(X) \text{ is not computable.}$$

Hence for almost all $X$ in the complement of $[\![Q]\!]$ we have that $M(X)$ is noncomputable, while for all $X$ in $[\![Q]\!]$ the image $M(X)$ is computable. This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

By the Kraft-Chaitin theorem it follows (see [BCP16] for a detailed proof) that

$$\text{given any } e \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ any string } \rho \text{ of length } e \text{ and any } \mathbf{0'}\text{-left-c.e. real } \alpha \in (0, 1-2^{-e}) \text{ there exists a } \Sigma^0_2 \text{ prefix-free set } S \text{ of strings which are incompatible with } \rho \text{ and } \mu(\llbracket S \rrbracket) = \alpha. \tag{3.2.1}$$

Here incompatibility is with regard to the prefix relation: a string $\eta$ is incompatible with a string $\rho$ if $\eta \neq \rho$ and $\eta$ is neither a prefix nor an extension of $\rho$ . Lemma 3.1 in combination with (3.2.1) implies the following item, which will be used in the argument of Section 3.3.

**Corollary 3.4.** *If $e \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho$ is a string of length $e$ and $\alpha$ is a $\mathbf{0'}$-left-c.e. real in $(0, 1-2^{-e})$, then there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that $M(\sigma)$ is the empty string for any string $\sigma$ which is compatible with $\rho$, and such that the probability that $M(X)$ is computable is exactly $\alpha$.*

Finally we want a corresponding statement for $\mathbf{0'}$-right-c.e. reals, which we can get from an analogue to Lemma 3.1 for $\Pi^0_2$ sets. Note that this case is much simpler and gives a stronger result (with the purported equivalence being satisfied by *every* real), which we formulate as follows.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Suppose that $Q$ is a $\Sigma^0_2$ prefix-free set of strings. Then there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that the following clauses are equivalent*

*(a) $M(X)$ is total;*

*(b) $M(X)$ is total and $M(X) = 0^\omega$;*

*(c) $X \notin \llbracket Q \rrbracket$;*

*for each real $X$.*

**Proof.** Let $(Q_s)$ be a canonical enumeration of $Q$ and construct $M$ as follows.

At stage $s+1$, for each $\sigma$ which does not have a prefix in $Q_s$ define $M(\sigma) = 0^{|\sigma|}$.

Clearly $M$ is monotone, hence well-defined. If $X$ has a prefix $\sigma$ in $Q$ then there exists a stage $s_0$ such that $\sigma \in Q_s$ for all $s \geq s_0$. In this case $M(X \upharpoonright_n)$ will not be defined for any $n \geq s_0$, so $M(X)$ is not total. For the other direction, assume that $X$ does not have a prefix in $Q$. Then there are infinitely many stages $s$ such that $X$ does not have a prefix in $Q_s$; for such $s$, the construction will define $M(X \upharpoonright_s) = 0^s$ at stage $s+1$. Hence $M(X)$ is total and equal to $0^\omega$. Finally if $M(X)$ is total, then necessarily $M(X) = 0^\omega$, which concludes the proof of the equivalence. □

The analogue of (3.2.1) for $\mathbf{0'}$-right-c.e. reals is as follows.

$$\text{given any } e \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ any string } \rho \text{ of length } e \text{ and any } \mathbf{0'}\text{-right-c.e. real } \beta \in (2^{-e}, 1) \text{ there exists a } \Sigma^0_2 \text{ prefix-free set } S \text{ of strings which are incompatible with } \rho \text{ and } 1-\mu(\llbracket S \rrbracket) = \beta. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Note that since $1-\beta$ is a $\mathbf{0'}$-left-c.e. real whenever $\beta$ is a $\mathbf{0'}$-right-c.e. real, (3.2.2) is a direct consequence of (3.2.1). Lemma 3.1 in combination with (3.2.2) implies the following item, which will be used in the argument of Section 3.3.

**Corollary 3.6.** *If $e \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho$ is a string of length $e$ and $\beta$ is a $\mathbf{0'}$-right-c.e. real in $(2^{-e}, 1)$, then there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that $M(\sigma)$ is the empty string, for any string $\sigma$ which is compatible with $\rho$, and such that the probability that $M(X)$ is computable is exactly $\beta$.*

We keep Corollaries 3.4 and 3.6 and use them as ingredients in the argument of the next section.

### 3.3 A universal machine for each difference of 0′-left-c.e. reals

The next step towards the proof of the second part of Theorem 1.1 is to produce *universal* oracle Turing machines with prescribed probability of a computable outcome. This is the main difference with the previous sections, and this is where the use of Martin-Löf randomness is most essential. We are two steps away from the final proof. First, we deal with the specific task of producing a universal machine such that the relevant probability is any given 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real in the unit interval (by symmetry the same holds for any given 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real).

In the proof below we use the following fact by Kučera and Slaman [KS01]:

> given any $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. 2-random real $\alpha$ and any $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real $\beta$, there exists $e$ such that $\alpha - 2^{-e} \cdot \beta$ is a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real. (3.3.1)

This fact was proved in [KS01] for left-c.e. reals and 1-randomness, but it readily relativizes to any oracle. The argument below is based on an idea from Calude, Hertling, Khoussainov, and Wang [CHKW01].

**Lemma 3.7.** *Given any 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real $\gamma \in (0,1)$, there exists a universal oracle machine $V$ such that the probability of $V(X)$ being computable is $\gamma$.*

**Proof.** Let $V_0$ be a universal oracle machine. Then by Lemma 3.1 there exist $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$ such that $V_0(X)$ is computable with probability $\alpha - \beta$. By (3.3.1) there exists some $e$ such that

- $\gamma - 2^{-e} \cdot \alpha$ is a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real;
- $\gamma - 2^{-e} \cdot (\alpha - \beta) \in \left(0, 1 - 2^{-e}\right)$.

In this case note that $\gamma - 2^{-e} \cdot (\alpha - \beta)$ is a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real in $(0,1)$. By Corollary 3.4 consider an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that $M(\sigma)$ is undefined for all $\sigma$ which are compatible with $0^e$ and the probability that $M(X)$ is total and computable is $\gamma - 2^{-e} \cdot (\alpha - \beta)$. Then for each $\sigma$ define $V(0^e * \sigma) = V_0(\sigma)$ and for all $\tau$ which is incompatible with $0^e$ define $V(\tau) = M(\tau)$. Then the probability that $V(X)$ is total and computable is the sum of probability that $M(X)$ is total and computable, plus $2^{-e}$ times the probability that $V_0(X)$ is total and computable. Hence $V(X)$ is total and computable with probability

$$\gamma - 2^{-e} \cdot (\alpha - \beta) + 2^{-e} \cdot (\alpha - \beta) = \gamma$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. □

In the following final step of our argument we are going to use a fact from Rettinger and Zheng [ZR04] which we state in relativized form as follows:

> If $\alpha, \beta$ are $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals and $\alpha - \beta$ is 2-random, then $\alpha - \beta$ is either a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real or a $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real. (3.3.2)

Another observation we need is that the sum of a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real with any $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real is 2-random. This is a relativization of the fact, originally proved by Demuth [Dem75], that the sum of a 1-random left-c.e. real with any left-c.e. real is 1-random. We also note that

> any difference of two $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals can be written as a difference of two 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals. (3.3.3)

In other words, for every $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals $\alpha,\beta$ there exist 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals $\alpha_0,\beta_0$ such that $\alpha-\beta=\alpha_0-\beta_0$. In order to see this, consider a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real $\gamma$, and take $\alpha_0=\alpha+\gamma$ and $\beta_0=\beta+\gamma$. Then (3.3.3) follows since the sum of a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real with any $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real is 2-random.[7]

The key ingredient of the proof of Lemma 3.8 is a result from [BLP16], which says that the difference between a d.c.e. real which is not 1-random and a 1-random left-c.e. real is a 1-random right-c.e. real. In relativized form this says that

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{If } \alpha,\beta,\gamma \text{ are } \mathbf{0}'\text{-left-c.e. reals, } \gamma \text{ is 2-random and } \alpha-\beta \text{ is not 2-random,}\\ &\text{then } (\alpha-\beta)-\gamma \text{ is a 2-random } \mathbf{0}'\text{-right-c.e. real.}\end{aligned}\tag{3.3.4}$$

Finally we also use the elementary fact that if $\alpha$ is a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real then for every $e$ the number $2^{-e}\cdot\alpha$ is a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let $\alpha,\beta$ be $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals such that $\alpha-\beta\in(0,1)$. Then there exists a universal Turing machine $M$ such that $M(X)$ is computable with probability exactly $\alpha-\beta$.*

**Proof.** By (3.3.3), without loss of generality we may assume that $\alpha,\beta$ are 2-random. First we consider the case where $\alpha-\beta$ is 2-random. In this case by (3.3.2) $\alpha-\beta$ is either a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. or a $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real. In the first case the result follows from Lemma 3.7. Otherwise $\alpha-\beta$ is $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. and we can use Lemma 3.7 to get a be a universal Turing machine $V$ such that the probability of $V(X)$ being computable is a $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real $\delta$. Also let $e$ be a number such that

$$(\alpha-\beta)-2^{-e}\cdot\delta\in\left(2^{-e},1\right)$$

and note that the real $(\alpha-\beta)-2^{-e}\cdot\delta$ is a $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. real with respect to which the number $e$ satisfies the condition of Corollary 3.6. So we can use Corollary 3.6 in order to get a machine $N$ such that $N(\sigma)$ is undefined for any string $\sigma$ which is compatible with $0^e$ (namely the string consisting of $e$ many 0s) and such that the probability that $N(X)$ is computable is $(\alpha-\beta)-2^{-e}\cdot\delta$. Now we can define $M(\rho)=N(\rho)$ for all $\rho$ which are incompatible with $0^e$, and $M(0^e*\sigma)=V(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma$. Then the probability that $M(X)$ is computable is the sum of the probability that $N(X)$ is computable, plus $2^{-e}$ times the probability that $V(X)$ is computable. Hence $M(X)$ is computable with probability

$$((\alpha-\beta)-2^{-e}\cdot\delta)+2^{-e}\cdot\delta=\alpha-\beta.$$

It remains to consider the case where $\alpha-\beta$ is not 2-random. Consider the universal machine $V$ as above, so that the probability of $V(X)$ being computable is a 2-random $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. real $\delta$. In this case by (3.3.4) the number $\alpha-\beta-2^{-e}\cdot\delta$ is $\mathbf{0}'$-right-c.e. for every $e$. Let $e$ be such that $\alpha-\beta-2^{-e}\cdot\delta\in(2^{-e},1)$ and use Corollary 3.6 in order to obtain a machine $N$ such that $N(\sigma)$ is undefined for any string $\sigma$ which is compatible with $0^e$ and $N(X)$ is computable with probability $\alpha-\beta-2^{-e}\cdot\delta$. Now define $M(\sigma)=N(\sigma)$ for all strings $\sigma$ which are incompatible with $0^e$, and $M(0^e*\rho)=V(\rho)$ for all $\rho$.

[7] Here we note that, quite surprisingly, the converse of (3.3.3) does not hold. In particular, Miller [Mil16] showed that there are $\mathbf{0}'$-d.c.e. reals $\gamma$ which are irreducible in the sense that for all $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals $\alpha,\beta$ such that $\gamma=\alpha-\beta$ we have that $\alpha,\beta$ are 2-random.

Then the probability that $M(X)$ is computable is the sum of the probability that $N(X)$ is computable, plus $2^{-e}$ times the probability that $V(X)$ is computable. Hence $M(X)$ is computable with probability

$$(\alpha - \beta - 2^{-e} \cdot \delta) + 2^{-e} \cdot \delta = \alpha - \beta$$

which concludes the proof of the lemma. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 4 Concluding remarks

We have characterized the universal probabilities of a computable output as the class of differences of $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals in $(0, 1)$. Our methodology as well as the characterization itself is novel in the context of existing research on the initial segment complexity of universal probabilities, and depends significantly on a number of non-trivial results from algorithmic randomness.

We believe that our approach is applicable to other problems in this area. As a demonstration, we give the following characterization of the universal probabilities that the output ends in a stream of 0s, as a corollary of the previous analysis.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If $V$ is a (universal) oracle Turing machine then the probability that $V(X) = \rho * 0^\omega$ for some string $\rho$ is $\alpha - \beta$ for some $\mathbf{0}'$-left-c.e. reals $\alpha, \beta$. Conversely, given $\alpha, \beta$ as above such that $\alpha - \beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a universal oracle Turing machine $V$ such that the probability that $V(X) = \rho * 0^\omega$ for some string $\rho$ is $\alpha - \beta$.*

The first part follows from the part that the class in question is the difference of two $\Pi^0_2$ classes. For the second part note that Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5 imply that the probability that $M(X)$ is computable equals the probability that $M(X) = \rho * 0^\omega$ for some string $\rho$. Therefore Corollary 3.4 and Corollary 3.6 hold for the probability that $M(X) = \rho * 0^\omega$ for some string $\rho$, in place of the probability that $M(X)$ is computable. This means that the machines $M$ constructed in the various cases of the proof of Lemma 3.8 also prove the second clause of Theorem 4.1.

## References


[ASWZ00] Klaus Ambos-Spies, Klaus Weihrauch, and Xizhong Zheng. Weakly computable real numbers. *J. Complexity*, 16(4):676–690, 2000.

[BC02] Verónica Becher and Gregory J. Chaitin. Another example of higher order randomness. *Fundam. Inform.*, 51(4):325–338, 2002.

[BCP16] George Barmpalias, Douglas Cenzer, and Christopher P. Porter. Random numbers as probabilities of machine behaviour. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 2016. (in press).

[BD12] George Barmpalias and David L. Dowe. Universality probability of a prefix-free machine. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 370(1971):3488–3511, 2012.

[BDC01] Verónica Becher, Sergio Daicz, and Gregory Chaitin. A highly random number. In C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen, and S. Sburlan, editors, *Combinatorics, Computability and Logic*, Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, pages 55–68. Springer London, 2001.

[BFGM06] Verónica Becher, Santiago Figueira, Serge Grigorieff, and Joseph S. Miller. Randomness and halting probabilities. *J. Symb. Log.*, 71(4):1411–1430, 2006.

[BG05] Verónica Becher and Serge Grigorieff. Random reals and possibly infinite computations part I: Randomness in $\emptyset'$. *J. Symb. Log.*, 70(3):891–913, 2005.

[BLP16] George Barmpalias and Andrew Lewis-Pye. Differences of halting probabilities. Arxiv: 1604.00216, 2016.

[Cal02] Cristian S. Calude. *Information and Randomness : An Algorithmic Perspective (Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series)*. Springer, November 2002.

[Cha75] Gregory J. Chaitin. A theory of program size formally identical to information theory. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 22:329–340, 1975.

[Cha92] Gregory J. Chaitin. Information-theoretic incompleteness. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 52(1):83–101, November 1992.

[Cha04] Gregory J. Chaitin. *Algorithmic Information Theory*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[CHKW01] Chris Calude, Peter Hertling, Bakhadyr Khoussainov, and Yongge Wang. Recursively enumerable reals and Chaitin $\Omega$ numbers. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 255(1-2):125–149, 2001.

[Dem75] Oswald Demuth. On constructive pseudonumbers. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 16:315–331, 1975. In Russian.

[DH10] Rodney Downey and Denis R. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Springer, 2010.

[dLMSS55] Karel de Leeuw, Edward F. Moore, Claude E. Shannon, and Norman Shapiro. Computability by probabilistic machines. In C. E. Shannon and J. McCarthy, editors, *Automata Studies*, pages 183–212. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1955.

[DNWY06] Rod Downey, André. Nies, Rebecca. Weber, and Liang Yu. Lowness and $\Pi^0_2$ nullsets. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 71(3):1044–1052, 2006.

[HNS07] Denis R. Hirschfeldt, André Nies, and Frank Stephan. Using random sets as oracles. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 75(3):610–622, 2007.

[Kob93] Kojiro Kobayashi. $\Sigma^0_n$-complete properties of programs and Martin-Löf randomness. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 46(1):37–42, 1993.

[KS01] Antonín Kučera and Theodore Slaman. Randomness and recursive enumerability. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 31(1):199–211, 2001.

[Kuč93] Antonín Kučera. On relative randomness. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 63(1):61–67, 1993. 9th International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science (Uppsala, 1991).

[Lev71] Leonid A. Levin. *Some Theorems on the Algorithmic Approach to Probability Theory and Information Theory*. Dissertation in mathematics, Moscow University, 1971. In Russian.

[Lev73] Leonid A. Levin. The concept of a random sequence. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 212:548–550, 1973.

[LV97] Ming Li and Paul Vitányi. *An introduction to Kolmogorov complexity and its applications*. Graduate Texts in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1997.

[Mil16] Joseph S. Miller. On work of Barmpalias and Lewis-Pye: a derivation on the d.c.e. reals. In *Festschrift volume for Downey's 60th birthday.* Springer LNCS series, 2016.

[ML66] Per Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and Control*, 9:602–619, 1966.

[MN06] Joseph S. Miller and André Nies. Randomness and computability: open questions. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 12(3):390–410, 2006.

[Ng06] Keng-Meng Ng. *Some Properties of d.c.e. Reals and their Degrees.* M.Sc. thesis, National University of Singapore, 2006.

[Nie09] André Nies. *Computability and Randomness*. Oxford University Press, 444 pp., 2009.

[Odi89] Piergiorgio G. Odifreddi. *Classical recursion theory. Vol. I.* North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.

[Odi99] Piergiorgio G. Odifreddi. *Classical recursion theory. Vol. II*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1999.

[Rai05] Alexander Raichev. Relative randomness and real closed fields. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 70(1):319–330, 2005.

[Sol64] Ray J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference I and II. *Information and Control*, 7:1–22, 1964.

[Sol75] Robert Solovay. Handwritten manuscript related to Chaitin's work. IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA, 215 pages, 1975.

[ZR04] Xizhong Zheng and Robert Rettinger. *Computing and Combinatorics: 10th Annual International Conference, COCOON 2004, Jeju Island, Korea, August 17-20, 2004. Proceedings*, chapter On the Extensions of Solovay-Reducibility, pages 360–369. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.